IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant:	Mitchell, James P.
Title:	COMMUNICATION SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR A MOBILE PLATFORM
Appl. No.:	09/493,472
Filing Date:	1/28/2000
Examiner:	Shang, Annan Q.
Art Unit:	2424
Confirmation Number:	2281

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 41.37, this Appeal Brief is being filed together with payment in the amount of $540.00 covering the 37 C.F.R. 41.20(b)(2) appeal fee. If this fee is deemed to be insufficient or missing, authorization is hereby given to charge any deficiency (or credit any balance) to the undersigned deposit account 19-0741.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

This application is assigned to, and the real party in interest in this application is, Rockwell Collins, Inc. having a place of business at 400 Collins Road, NE, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52498. The real party in interest is Rockwell Collins, Inc.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

This is an appeal from the Final Office Action of July 11, 2008. Claims 1-30 are pending, have been finally rejected, and are all on appeal. Claims 31-38 were previously cancelled. With this appeal, Appellant appeals the final rejection of claims 1-30.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments to the claims have been requested to be entered since the Final Office Action of July 11, 2008.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Now referring to the Figures and specific passages in the specification, the present invention relates generally to a communication system for a mobile platform (Specification, page 7, lines 2-3).

On-board entertainment systems can be utilized to generate video images and audio content for users of a mobile platform. (Specification, page 2, lines 4-6). One such exemplary on-board entertainment system is an aircraft passenger entertainment system. (Specification, page 2, lines 14-15). Some entertainment systems utilize on-board sources (e.g., tape players) to provide content that do not allow live programs to be viewed on the mobile platform. (Specification, page 2, lines 18-23). Other entertainment systems utilize off-board sources (e.g.,

direct broadcast satellite, or DBS, systems) that may provide live or near live video to passengers. (Specification, page 3, lines 1-4). Such off-board systems may cease to work as the mobile platform enters locations that are out of range of the off-board system. (Specification, page 3, lines 6-8). Additionally, off-board systems may broadcast the same data to all mobile platforms within range of the content source and may not be able to feature content specific to a particular mobile platform. (Specification, page 3, lines 11-13). The presently pending claims are directed to systems and methods that provide for the playback of live video or stored video, or both, on a mobile platform. (Specification, page 24, lines 21-26).

Appellants respectfully request individual consideration of each of the following groups:

1. Claims 1-3, 6, and 9-11 and 13-16 essentially stand or fall together and are therefore grouped together. Independent claim 1 is the representative claim for the group.
2. Claim 12 comprises the second group.
3. Claims 17-19, 21-22, and 25-30 essentially stand or fall together and are therefore grouped together. Independent claim 17 is the representative claim for the group.
4. Claims 4-5 and 20 are grouped together.
5. Claims 7-8 and 23-24 are grouped together.

Claim 1, the representative claim of the first group, recites a communication system (e.g., ref. no. 30, Figs. 1-3; Specification, page 12, lines 2-3) for a mobile platform (e.g., ref. no. 35, Figs. 1-2; Specification, page 12, lines 1-3). The mobile platform is stationary at a docking area (ref. no. 37, Fig. 2; Specification, page 14, lines 12-18). The communication system includes a server (ref. no. 39, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-5) located in the docking area. The server includes a wireless docking area transceiver (ref. nos. 70 and 72, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-14, page 16, lines 19-20), a first satellite receiver (ref. no. 76, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-7), and a first storage unit (ref. no. 74, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-7). The server is configured to store order wire data (Specification, page 15, lines 5-7, page 24, lines 8-27, page 33, line 22 through page 34, line 12) received by the first satellite receiver, and to store video data (Specification, page 15, line 5 through page 16, line 4) received by the first satellite receiver in the storage unit in response to the order wire data. The system

further includes a second satellite receiver (ref. nos. 62 and 64, Fig. 2; Specification, page 14, line 22 through page 15, line 2, page 16, lines 20-22) located on the mobile platform. The system further includes a wireless platform transceiver (ref. nos. 60 and 66, Fig. 2; Specification, page 14, lines 22-28, page 16, lines 19-20) located on the mobile platform. The wireless platform transceiver receives the order wire data and the video data from the wireless docking area transceiver while the mobile platform is at the docking area (Specification, page 15, lines 3-14). The system further includes a second storage unit (ref. no. 52, Figs. 1-2; Specification, page 12, lines 4-6, page 13, line 25 through page 14, line 4) located on the mobile platform. The second storage unit stores the video data for playback in the mobile platform (Specification, page 13, lines 8-11). The second storage unit also stores the order wire data (Specification, page 9, line 6). The order wire data controls a source of video for playback of a program being either video data in the second storage unit or the second satellite receiver, or both the second storage unit and the second satellite receiver (Specification, page 24, lines 8-27).

Claim 12, the representative claim of the second group, is directed to a video system for a mobile platform (e.g., ref. nos. 30 and 35, Figs. 1-3; Specification, page 12, lines 1-3), the mobile platform capable of traveling to a docking area (e.g., a docking area, ref. no. 37, Fig. 2; Specification, page 14, lines 12-18), the docking area having a first transceiver for providing data representative of video (ref. no. 70, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-14, page 16, lines 19-20). The video system includes a wireless transceiver configured to receive the data representative of video and order data from the first transceiver (ref. no. 60, Fig. 2; Specification, page 14, lines 22-28, page 16, lines 19-20). The video system further includes a first storage unit coupled to the wireless transceiver, the first storage unit storing the data representative of video and the order data (Specification, page 9, line 6, page 13, lines 8-11, page 15, lines 11-13). The video system yet further includes a first satellite receiver configured to receive video data from a satellite (e.g., ref. no. 50, Fig. 1, ref. nos. 62 and 64, Fig. 2; Specification, page 12, lines 15-22, page 14, line 22 through page 15, line 2). The video system yet further includes a processor coupled to the first storage unit and the first satellite receiver, the processor determining whether to use the data representative of video from the first storage unit or the video data from the first

satellite receiver in response to the order data (Specification, page 24, lines 8-27), the processor generating a program in response to the data representative of video stored in the first storage unit or the video data received by the first satellite receiver (Specification, page 24, lines 17-27). The first transceiver (ref. no. 70, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-14, page 16, lines 19-20) is included as part of a server located in the docking area (ref. no. 39, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-5). The server includes the first transceiver, a second satellite receiver (ref. no. 76, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-7), and a second storage unit (ref. no. 74, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-7), the server being configured to store the order data. The order data is received by the second satellite receiver (Specification, page 15, lines 5-7), and to store the data representative of video. The data representative of video is received by the second satellite receiver and stored in the second storage unit in response to the order data (Specification, page 15, lines 5-7).

Claim 17, the representative claim of the third group, is directed to a method of showing video images (Specification, page 14, lines 4-10) related to the video data (Specification, page 15, line 5 through page 16, line 4) on a mobile platform (e.g., ref. no. 35, Figs. 1-2; Specification, page 12, lines 1-3). The mobile platform is capable of traveling to a location (e.g., a docking area, ref. no. 37, Fig. 2; Specification, page 14, lines 12-18). The location has a server (ref. no. 39, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-5) including a transmitter (ref. no. 70, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-14, page 16, lines 19-20), a satellite receiver (ref. no. 76, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-7), and a storage unit (ref. no. 74, Fig. 2; Specification, page 15, lines 3-7). The method includes storing order wire data in the storage unit (Specification, page 15, lines 5-7). The order wire data is received by the satellite receiver (Specification, page 15, lines 5-7). The method further includes storing video data in the storage unit (Specification, page 15, lines 5-7). The video data is received by the satellite receiver and stored in the storage unit in response to the order wire data (Specification, page 15, lines 5-7, page 24, lines 9-16). The method further includes electronically receiving the video data and the order wire data from the transmitter with a receiver (ref. no. 60, Fig. 2; Specification, page 14, lines 22-28, page 16, lines 19-20) while the mobile platform is proximate the location (Specification, page 14, lines 21-27,

page 15, lines 5-14). The method further includes storing the video data and the order wire data on-board the mobile platform (Specification, page 9, line 6, page 13, lines 8-11, page 15, lines 11-13). The method further includes receiving video signals from a satellite transmitter (e.g., ref. nos. 93A, 93B and 94, Fig. 3; Specification, page 17, lines 16-27) by a mobile platform satellite receiver (e.g., ref. no. 50, Fig. 1, ref. nos. 62 and 64, Fig. 2; Specification, page 12, lines 15-22, page 14, line 22 through page 15, line 2). The method further includes displaying the video images on-board the mobile platform (e.g., via display, ref. no. 56, Fig. 1; Specification, page 13, lines 8-16) in accordance with the video data stored on-board the mobile platform or with the video signals being received by the mobile platform satellite receiver in response to the order wire data for a program (Specification, page 24, lines 17-27).

Claims 4-5 and 20, the claims of the fourth group, are separately patentable as their claimed features are not shown in the references of record. Claim 4 includes the system of claim 1 "wherein the wireless docking transceiver is a short range transceiver" (Specification, page 16, lines 12-22). Claim 5 includes the system of claim 1 "wherein the wireless platform transceiver is a radio frequency short range transceiver" (Specification, page 16, lines 12-22). Claim 20 includes the method of claim 17 "wherein the electronically receiving step utilizes a short range wireless receiver" (Specification, page 16, lines 12-22).

Claims 7-8 and 23-24, the claims of the fifth group, are separately patentable as their claimed features are not shown in the references of record. Claim 7 includes the system of claim 1 "wherein the mobile platform is a boat, ship or train" (Specification, page 12, lines 7-14). Claim 8 includes the system of claim 1 "wherein the mobile platform is a road traveling vehicle" (Specification, page 12, lines 7-14). Claim 23 includes the method of claim 17 "wherein the mobile platform is a boat, ship or train" (Specification, page 12, lines 7-14). Claim 24 includes the method of claim 17 "wherein the mobile platform is a road traveling vehicle" (Specification, page 12, lines 7-14).

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

I. Whether claims 1-3, 6, and 9-11 and 13-16 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,201,797 to Leuca et al. (hereinafter "Leuca") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,524,272 to Podowski et al. (hereinafter "Podowski").

II. Whether claim 12 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,201,797 to Leuca et al. (hereinafter "Leuca") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,524,272 to Podowski et al. (hereinafter "Podowski").

III. Whether claims 17-19, 21-22, and 25-30 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leuca in view of Podowski.

IV. Whether claims 4-5 and 20 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leuca in view of Podowski.

V. Whether claims 7-8 and 23-24 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leuca in view of Podowski.

ARGUMENT

I. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF SELECT REFERENCES

U.S. Patent No. 6,201,797, Leuca, teaches a high bandwidth delivery and internet access for airborne passengers. (Leuca, title). Leuca teaches a system for providing two way communications between an airborne data terminal station, such as a laptop computer, and a ground-based network. (Leuca, col. 2, lines 48-53).

U.S. Patent No. 5,524,272, Podowski, teaches a method and apparatus for distributing program material. (Podowski, title). Podowski teaches that aircraft may review a schedule of available program material and submit a program request for desired programs. (Podowski, col. 2, lines 42-44). In response, Podowski teaches that the requested programs are distributed at

airline terminals to the aircraft, where they are stored for subsequent in-flight viewing. (Podowski, col. 2, line 65 through col. 3, line 4).

II. BACKGROUND

All claim rejections at issue in this appeal are made under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), which states:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) involves four factual inquiries: 1) the scope and content of the prior art; 2) the differences between the claims and the prior art; 3) the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and 4) secondary considerations, if any, of nonobviousness. See Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1966). See also KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1734, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1391 (2007) ("While the sequence of these questions might be reordered in any particular case, the [Graham] factors continue to define the inquiry that controls.").

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. See In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 USPQ2d 1955,1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). A prima facie case of obviousness is established by presenting evidence that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the relevant teachings of the references to arrive at the claimed invention. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Lintner, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972). A broad conclusory statement regarding the obviousness of modifying a reference, standing alone, is not "evidence." Thus, when an examiner relies on general

knowledge to negate patentability, that knowledge must be articulated and placed on the record. See In re Lee, 277 F.3d 1338, 1342-45, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002). See also In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Recently, in KSR Int'l v. Teleflex, the Supreme Court rejected a rigid approach to the question of obviousness. 550 U.S. 398, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1738 (2007). At the same time, however, the Supreme Court recognized that "inventions in most, if not all, instances rely upon building blocks long since uncovered, and claimed discoveries almost of necessity will be combinations of what, in some sense, is already known." Id. at 1741. Thus, a patent composed of several elements "is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art." Id. Therefore, there must be an articulated reasoning with a rational underpinning to support a legal conclusion of obviousness. Id. ("[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.")(quoting In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

III. APPROPRIATENESS OF REJECTIONS

1. Claims 1-3, 6, 9-11 and 13-16 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Leuca in view of Podowski because Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leuca in view of Podowski. Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness because Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest all features recited in the claims.

Claim 1 recites a communication system for a mobile platform that is stationary at a docking area. The communication system includes a server located in the docking area. The server includes a wireless docking area transceiver, a first satellite receiver, and a first storage unit. The server is configured to store order wire data received by the first satellite receiver, and to store video data received by the first satellite receiver in the storage unit in response to the order wire data. The system also includes a second satellite receiver located on the mobile platform. The system also includes a wireless platform transceiver located on the mobile platform that receives the order wire data and the video data from the wireless docking area transceiver while the mobile platform is at the docking area. The system further includes a second storage unit located on the mobile platform that stores the video data for playback in the mobile platform. The second storage unit also stores the order wire data. The order wire data controls a source of video for playback of a program being either video data in the second storage unit or the second satellite receiver, or both the second storage unit and the second satellite receiver.

As can be seen in the above summary, Claim 1 includes a number of recitations of "order wire data" and how elements of Claim 1 utilize the order wire data to conduct the functions of Claim 1.

Appellant's specification discusses "order wire data" in greater detail on page 24 as follows:

> In Figure 9, a communications control processor and memory channel manager 517 routes the data received from DBS receiver 510. A program order wire included with the data at data source 105 (in Figure 6) and transmitted with the data may be used to entitle, queue, and control using the communications control processor and memory channel manager 517, mass memory storage unit 515 what data to store, from a channel, at a given time. For example, the order wire data may entitle mass memory storage unit 515 to store a movie on a certain channel that has been ordered and paid for a particular aircraft or group of aircraft and is sent over wireless airport gateway communications system 100.

> The order wire allows programming on each individual aircraft 120 to be controlled by a central location. The order wire enables system 100 to operate as essentially an affiliate television station on-board each of aircraft 120. The order wire can set the content, time, and source of programs available on each of aircraft 120. Further, the order wire can direct the reception of live and near-live broadcasts. In one example, the order wire can direct the playback of a game which has been stored in unit 515. In another example, the order wire can direct the playback a game which is in progress when aircraft 120 is parked at gateway 125. The first 30 minutes of the game could be played back from unit 515 while the remainder of the game is received from satellite 240. Thus, the order wire can ensure property synchronization of the playback of programs.

Leuca and Podowski, alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose at least seven features recited in Claim 1 and related to the use of order wire data:

(1) order wire data that controls a source of video playback of a program;

(2) a source of video may be video data in the storage unit on the mobile platform, video data from a satellite receiver on the mobile platform, or both;

(3) the order wire data is received by a satellite receiver in a docking area;

(4) a server located in the docking area and configured to store the order wire data;

(5) a server located in the docking area and configured to store video data received by the satellite receiver in the docking area in response to the order wire data;

(6) a wireless platform transceiver on a mobile platform receiving the order wire data from a wireless docking area transceiver while the mobile platform is at the docking area; and

(7) a storage unit located on the mobile platform that stores the order wire data.

Appellants will address each of the above deficiencies of Leuca and Podowski in turn.

a. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose order wire data that controls a source of video for playback of a program.

Claim 1 recites, in combination with other elements, "order wire data [that] controls a source of video for playback of a program." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper

combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest order wire data that controls a source of video for playback of a program.

Leuca discloses only the provision of data from a satellite receiver to an aircraft. Leuca does not disclose "order wire data" or any other data that controls a source of video for playback of a program. Leuca discloses a data transport mechanism that can be used to distribute video, voice or audio, and textual data signals to a display screen. (Leuca, col. 3, lines 13-15). However, Leuca does not disclose the receipt, storage, or usage of any type of data that may be used to **control a video source** for playback on the display screen. Leuca discloses that a laptop connected to the disclosed on-board system may send a data request to a website, but the data request of Leuca is only a request for the transmission of data from the website to the laptop. (Leuca, col. 5, lines 40-48). The data request of Leuca is not used to control the source used for the playback of a program.

Podowski also does not disclose order wire data that controls a source of video for playback of a program. Podowski discloses program requests that are sent from individual and stationary airline terminals to a centralized distribution center (see Fig. 1 of Podowski for a network topography)(see also Fig. 2 of Podowski, "airline issues program requests"; and Podowski, col. 2, lines 42-47). These program requests are not order wire data that control a source of video for playback, but rather are selections of programs that are transmitted from stationary airline terminals to a centralized distribution center. Podowski further discloses that the program requests are organized into "composite signals" that may include an identification of the programs selected by the stationary airline terminals as well as routing information that indicates how selected programs of an airline are to be distributed to specific aircraft. (Podowski, col. 2, lines 60-65). These composite signals are also not order wire data that control a source of video for playback, are not received by individual aircraft, and only identify how selected programs from the program requests should be assigned to specific aircraft. Accordingly, neither Leuca nor Podowski, nor any valid combination thereof, disclose the order

wire data recited in Claim 1. Appellants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

b. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose that a source of video may be video data in the storage unit on the mobile platform, video data from a satellite receiver on the mobile platform, or both.

Claim 1 further recites that "order wire data controls a source of video for playback of a program being either video data in the second storage unit or the second satellite receiver, or **both the second storage unit and the second satellite receiver**." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest that a source of video for playback of a program may be video data in a storage unit, video data from a satellite receiver, or both.

Leuca and Podowski each disclose a single source of data for use in an aircraft. Leuca discloses only the reception of data from a satellite receiver. Leuca does not disclose that video data is stored on-board an aircraft. Leuca includes a data server, but it is not used for the storage of video for playback. Regarding the data server of Leuca, Leuca states:

> Data server 12 acts as an intelligent airborne gateway and performs multiplexing and necessary call control functions. More specifically, data server 12 provides 3 general functions: 1) controlling various data transport interfaces; 2) multiplexing, routing, and priority queuing functions for data packet; and 3) updating and maintaining various databases depending on the application as an off-line process and providing uniform user interface capability (API) to client applications.

(Leuca, col. 3, lines 44-53).

Podowski discloses only playback of video stored in an aircraft. (Podowski, col. 3, lines 1-4). Podowski does not disclose the reception of video data from a satellite receiver. Accordingly, neither Leuca nor Podowski disclose a system having multiple sources of playback of video data including video data from a storage unit, a satellite receiver, or both. Even if the combination of Leuca and Podowski were to teach the provision of video data from storage on-

board an aircraft, from a satellite, and/or both, Leuca and Podowski still are silent as to any order wire data or other control signal that may be used to control or switch between the source(s) for playback.

c. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose that the order wire data is received by a satellite receiver in a docking area.

Claim 1 further recites, in combination with other elements, "a server **located in the docking area** and comprising a wireless docking area transceiver, a first satellite receiver, and a first storage unit, the server being configured to store **order wire data received by the first satellite receiver**." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest order wire data received by a satellite receiver at a docking area.

Neither Leuca nor Podowski teach that order wire data, which controls a source of video for playback of a program, is received by a satellite receiver located in a docking area. The Examiner acknowledged that Leuca "fails to explicitly teach the claimed limitation docking area for receiving order wire and video data." (Final Office Action, page 5, lines 11-12).

Podowski discloses a receiver apparatus, including a satellite transceiver, that may be used at airline terminals. (Podowski, col. 4, lines 52-54). However, Podowski teaches only that satellite transceivers located at Podowski's stationary airline terminals receive a composite signal that tells electronics at the stationary airline terminal how to route programming to certain aircraft. (Podowski, col. 5, lines 6-15; see *supra* part 1(a) for a more detailed discussion of composite signals as taught by Podowski). As previously discussed, the composite signals and/or program requests taught by Podowski are not order wire data and do not control a source of video for playback of a program.

d. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose a server located in a docking area and configured to store the order wire data received by the satellite receiver at the docking area.

Claim 1 further recites, in combination with other elements, "a server **located in the docking area** and comprising a wireless docking area transceiver, a first satellite receiver, and a first storage unit, **the server being configured to store order wire data** received by the first satellite receiver." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest a server configured to store order wire data received by a satellite receiver at a docking area.

Neither Leuca nor Podowski teach a server located in a docking area and configured to store order wire data received from a satellite receiver. Leuca discloses a data server including a database, but only teaches that the server is configured to store a routing table for directing data and voice packets to a data transport interface circuit, **not order wire data**. (Leuca, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 3). Furthermore, the data server taught by Leuca is an "airborne gateway" not located in a docking area and, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Leuca fails to explicitly teach a docking area for receiving order wire and video data.

Podowski discloses a video server, including a storage area, that is assigned to each airline and/or airline terminal. (Podowski, col. 4, lines 53-55, col. 5, lines 16-17). Podowski teaches that the video server is configured to store a composite signal including program requests and a catalog of ordered programs (for browsing by aircraft passengers). (Podowski, col. 4, lines 56-60). However, as discussed above, the composite signal and/or program request taught by Podowski is not order wire data. The catalog does not relate to control of a source of video for playback and is therefore not order wire data.

e. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose a server configured to store video data received by the satellite receiver at the docking area in response to the order wire data.

Claim 1 further recites, in combination with other elements, "the server being configured to store order wire data received by the first satellite receiver, and to store video data received by the first satellite receiver in the storage unit in response to the order wire data." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest a server configured to store video data received by a satellite receiver in response to order wire data.

Neither Leuca nor Podowski teach a server configured to store video data received by a satellite receiver **in response to order wire data**. Leuca does not disclose a docking area or order wire data and teaches only storing a routing table in an airborne data server, not video data in a server located in a docking area. Podowski discloses storing programs in a video server for subsequent in-flight playback based on program requests. (Podowski, col. 2, line 52 through col. 3, line 4, col. 4, lines 54-60). However, as discussed above, program requests are not order wire data and do not control a source of video for playback of a program. Significantly, the program requests of Podowski are provided from the stationary airline terminals of Podowski (see Figs. 1 and 2 of Podowski, and related text) to a centralized distribution center and are not received at a satellite receiver and/or server of an aircraft. Accordingly, it would not make sense for the aircraft server of Podowski (or of the present Claims) to "respond" to a request that it never receives.

f. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose a wireless platform transceiver on a mobile platform receiving the order wire data from a wireless docking area transceiver while the mobile platform is at the docking area.

Claim 1 further recites "a wireless platform transceiver on the mobile platform receiving the order wire data and the video data from the wireless docking area transceiver while the

mobile platform is at the docking area." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest the recited wireless platform transceiver.

Neither Leuca nor Podowski teach a wireless platform transceiver on a mobile platform receiving order wire data while the mobile platform is in a docking area. The Examiner acknowledged that Leuca fails to disclose a system that "communicates data to the mobile platform while the mobile platform is at the docking area." (Final Office Action, page 5, lines 13-14). Podowski discloses on-board aircraft equipment including a LAN interface that receives ordered programs from a video server at the stationary airline terminals. (Podowski, col. 4, lines 39-44). However, the ordered programs are merely video data (the programs themselves) and related information being transferred from a video server. The ordered programs are not order wire data that controls a source of video for playback of a program.

g. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose a storage unit located on the mobile platform that stores the order wire data.

Claim 1 further recites a "second storage unit being located on the mobile platform, … the second storage unit storing the order wire data." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest a storage unit located on a mobile platform that stores order wire data.

Neither Leuca nor Podowski teach a server located on a mobile platform that **stores order wire data**. Leuca teaches a data server that stores a routing table for directing data and voice packets to a data transport interface circuit, not order wire data. (Leuca, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 3). The routing table of Leuca is merely for packetized data communications purposes and would not include any information specific to any video program and/or video source. Podowski discloses on-board aircraft equipment including a memory area that stores ordered programs received from a video server for subsequent in-flight viewing. (Podowski, col. 6, lines 49-51). However, as previously discussed, ordered programs (the actual video content) are not order wire data and do not control a source of video for playback.

Claim 1 is nonobvious over Leuca and Podowski because Claim 1 recites at least seven features related to the use of order wire data not disclosed, taught or suggested by those references: (1) order wire data that controls a source of video playback of a program; (2) a source of video may be video data in the storage unit on the mobile platform, video data from a satellite receiver on the mobile platform, or both; (3) the order wire data is received by a satellite receiver in a docking area; (4) a server located in the docking area and configured to store the order wire data; (5) a server located in the docking area and configured to store video data received by the satellite receiver in the docking area in response to the order wire data; (6) a wireless platform transceiver on a mobile platform receiving the order wire data from a wireless docking area transceiver while the mobile platform is at the docking area; and (7) a storage unit located on the mobile platform that stores the order wire data. Independent claims 12 and 13 are nonobvious because they recite features related to the use of order wire data similar to those recited in claim 1. Claims 2-3, 6, 9-11, and 14-16, depending variously from independent claims 1 and 13, are nonobvious at least for the same reasons as their respective independent claims. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, and 9-16, and all other claims depending from independent claims 1, 12, and 13, over Leuca in view of Podowski is improper.

2. Claim 12 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Leuca in view of Podowski because Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Leuca and Podowski, alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose at least five features recited in Claim 12 and related to the use of order wire data. In Claim 12, order wire data:

(1) is received by a wireless transceiver on the mobile platform;

(2) is stored by a storage unit on the mobile platform;

(3) is responded to by a processor to determine whether to use video from the local storage unit or video from a satellite receiver;

(4) is stored by a server located in a docking area separate from the mobile platform; and

(5) is responded to by the server in the docking area by storing video from a second satellite receiver.

a. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose receiving the order wire data by a wireless transceiver on the mobile platform.

Claim 12 further recites, in combination with other elements, "a wireless transceiver configured to receive the data representative of video and order data from the first transceiver." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest receiving the order wire data by a wireless transceiver on the mobile platform. As is explained above, "order wire data" is not received at a mobile platform in either Leuca or Podowski.

b. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose storing the order wire data on-board the mobile platform.

Claim 12 further recites, in combination with other elements, "a first storage unit coupled to the wireless transceiver, the first storage unit storing the data representative of video and the order data." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest storing order wire data on-board the mobile platform in a first storage unit.

Leuca discloses storing a routing table for directing data and voice packets to a data transport interface circuit, not storing order wire data. (Leuca, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 3). Podowski teaches storing programs received from a video server in an on-board memory area for subsequent in-flight viewing. (Podowski, col. 6, lines 49-51). However, as previously discussed, ordered programs are not order wire data.

c. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose determining whether to use video from the a local storage unit or video from a satellite receiver in response to the order data.

Claim 12 further recites, in combination with other elements, "the processor determining whether to use the data representative of video from the first storage unit or the video data from the first satellite receiver in response to the order data." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest determining whether to use determining whether to use video from the a local storage unit or video from a satellite receiver in response to the order data.

Leuca discloses only the provision of data from a satellite receiver to an aircraft. Leuca does not disclose "order wire data" or any other data that is used to determine whether to use video from the a local storage unit or video from a satellite receiver in response to the order data. Leuca discloses a data transport mechanism that can be used to distribute video, voice or audio, and textual data signals to a display screen. (Leuca, col. 3, lines 13-15). However, Leuca does not disclose the receipt, storage, or usage of any type of data that may be used to **determine a video source** for playback on the display screen. Leuca discloses that a laptop connected to the disclosed on-board system may send a data request to a website, but the data request of Leuca is only a request for the transmission of data from the website to the laptop. (Leuca, col. 5, lines 40-48). The data request of Leuca is not used to determine or select the source used for the playback of a program.

Podowski also does not disclose order wire data that is used to determine a source of video for playback of a program. Podowski discloses program requests that are sent from individual and stationary airline terminals to a centralized distribution center (see Fig. 1 of Podowski for a network topography)(see also Fig. 2 of Podowski, "airline issues program requests"; and Podowski, col. 2, lines 42-47). These program requests are not order wire data that are used to determine a source of video for playback, but rather are selections of programs that are transmitted from stationary airline terminals to a centralized distribution center. Podowski further discloses that the program requests are organized into "composite signals" that may include an identification of the programs selected by the stationary airline terminals as well as routing information that indicates how selected programs of an airline are to be distributed to

specific aircraft. (Podowski, col. 2, lines 60-65). These composite signals are also not order wire data that control a source of video for playback, are not received by individual aircraft, and only identify how selected programs from the program requests should be assigned to specific aircraft. Accordingly, neither Leuca nor Podowski, nor any valid combination thereof, disclose the order wire data recited in Claim 12. Appellants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 12.

d. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose storing order wire data in a storage unit of a server located in a docking area separate from the mobile platform.

Leuca discloses storing a routing table for directing data packets and voice packets to a data transport interface circuit in a data server, but does not disclose storing order wire data in the data server. (Leuca, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 3). Furthermore, the data server disclosed by Leuca is an airborne gateway and is not at a location to which a mobile platform is capable of travelling. Podowski discloses storing a composite signal, including program request, and a catalog of ordered programs in a video server. (Podowski, col. 4, lines 56-60). However, as discussed with respect to claim 1, the composite signal, program request and/or catalog of ordered programs taught by Podowski is not order wire data.

e. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose that the order wire data is responded to by the server in the docking area by storing video from a second satellite receiver.

Leuca, as acknowledged by the Examiner, fails to disclose a location to which a mobile platform is capable of traveling for receiving order wire and video data. Podowski discloses detecting a composite signal including requests for programming and routing information for routing programming to certain aircraft via a satellite transceiver that may be used at an airline terminal. (Podowski, col. 4, lines 52-54, col. 5, lines 6-15). However, as previously discussed, the composite signal taught by Podowski is not order wire data.

3. Claims 17-19, 21-22, and 25-30 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Leuca in view of Podowski because Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Claim 17 recites a method of showing video images related to the video data on a mobile platform capable of traveling to a location. The location has a server including a transmitter, a satellite receiver, and a storage unit. The method includes storing order wire data in the storage unit. The order wire data is received by the satellite receiver. The method further includes storing video data in the storage unit. The video data is received by the satellite receiver and stored in the storage unit in response to the order wire data. The method further includes electronically receiving the video data and the order wire data from the transmitter with a receiver while the mobile platform is proximate the location. The method further includes storing the video data and the order wire data on-board the mobile platform. The method further includes receiving video signals from a satellite transmitter by a mobile platform satellite receiver. The method further includes displaying the video images on-board the mobile platform in accordance with the video data stored on-board the mobile platform or with the video signals being received by the mobile platform satellite receiver in response to the order wire data for a program.

Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest at least six features recited in Claim 17 related to the use of order wire data:

(1) storing order wire data in a storage unit at a location to which the mobile platform travels;

(2) order wire data being received by a satellite receiver at the location;

(3) video data being received by the satellite receiver and stored in the storage unit in response to the order wire data;

(4) electronically receiving the order wire data from a transmitter at the location with a

receiver while the mobile platform is proximate the location;

(5) storing the order wire data on-board the mobile platform; and

(6) displaying video images on-board the mobile platform in accordance with video data stored on-board the mobile platform or with video signals being received by a mobile platform satellite receiver in response to the order wire data.

a. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose storing order wire data in a storage unit at a location.

Claim 17 recites, in combination with other elements, "storing order wire data in the storage unit." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest storing order wire data in a storage unit at a location.

Leuca discloses storing a routing table for directing data packets and voice packets to a data transport interface circuit in a data server, but does not disclose storing order wire data in the data server. (Leuca, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 3). Furthermore, the data server disclosed by Leuca is an airborne gateway and is not at a location to which a mobile platform is capable of travelling. Podowski discloses storing a composite signal, including program request, and a catalog of ordered programs in a video server. (Podowski, col. 4, lines 56-60). However, as discussed with respect to claim 1, the composite signal, program request and/or catalog of ordered programs taught by Podowski is not order wire data.

b. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose that the order wire data is received by a satellite receiver at the location.

Claim 17 further recites, in combination with other elements, "wherein the order wire data is received by the satellite receiver." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest order wire data being received by a satellite receiver at the location.

Leuca, as acknowledged by the Examiner, fails to disclose a location to which a mobile platform is capable of traveling for receiving order wire and video data. Podowski discloses detecting a composite signal including requests for programming and routing information for routing programming to certain aircraft via a satellite transceiver that may be used at an airline terminal. (Podowski, col. 4, lines 52-54, col. 5, lines 6-15). However, as previously discussed, the composite signal taught by Podowski is not order wire data.

c. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose that video data is received by the satellite receiver and stored in the storage unit in response to the order wire data.

Claim 17 further recites, in combination with other elements, "storing video data in the storage unit, wherein the video data is received by the satellite receiver and stored in the storage unit in response to the order wire data." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest that video data is received by a satellite receiver and stored in a storage unit in response to order wire data.

Neither Leuca nor Podowski teach storing video in a storage unit **in response to order wire data**. Leuca does not disclose a location to which a mobile platform is capable of traveling, and teaches only storing a routing table in an airborne data server, not video data in a server located at the location. Podowski discloses storing programs in video servers in response to a composite signal including program requests. (Podowski, col. 2, line 52 through col. 3, line 4, col. 4, lines 54-60). However, as previously discussed, the composite signal and/or program request taught by Podowski is not order wire data.

d. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose electronically receiving the order wire data from a transmitter at the location with a receiver while a mobile platform is proximate the location.

Claim 17 further recites, in combination with other elements, "electronically receiving the video data and the order wire data from the transmitter with a receiver while the mobile platform is proximate the location." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest electronically receiving order wire data.

Leuca, as acknowledged by the Examiner, fails to disclose communicating data to a mobile platform while the mobile platform is in a docking area. Podowski discloses receiving ordered programs from an airline terminal via a LAN interface while an aircraft is located at the terminal. (Podowski, col. 4, lines 39-44). However, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the ordered programs are not order wire data.

e. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose storing the order wire data on-board the mobile platform.

Claim 17 further recites, in combination with other elements, "storing the video data and the order wire data on-board the mobile platform." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest storing order wire data on-board the mobile platform.

Leuca discloses storing a routing table for directing data and voice packets to a data transport interface circuit, not storing order wire data. (Leuca, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 3). Podowski teaches storing programs received from a video server in an on-board memory area for subsequent in-flight viewing. (Podowski, col. 6, lines 49-51). However, as previously discussed, ordered programs are not order wire data.

f. Leuca and Podowski do not disclose displaying video images on-board the mobile platform in accordance with video data stored on-board the mobile

platform or with video signals being received by a mobile platform satellite receiver in response to the order wire data.

Claim 17 further recites, in combination with other elements, "displaying the video images on-board the mobile platform in accordance with the video data stored on-board the mobile platform or with the video signals being received by the mobile platform satellite receiver in response to the order wire data for a program." Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest displaying video images in accordance with video data stored on-board a mobile platform or received by a satellite receiver in response to order wire data, wherein the order wire data is received by the satellite receiver.

Leuca discloses displaying video, voice/audio and textual data received via air-to-ground (e.g., satellite) links on a display screen located, for example, on the back of passenger seats on an aircraft. (Leuca, col. 3, lines 13-15). However, Leuca does not disclose displaying the data in response to order wire data or any other particular control and/or data signal. Podowski discloses receiving a composite signal at an airline terminal from a distribution center that includes a program request and routing information indicating which programs should be assigned to specific aircraft. (Podowski, col. 2, lines 53-65). Podowski also discloses receiving ordered programs at an aircraft from an airline terminal based on the composite signal. (Podowski, col. 2, line 65 through col. 3, line 2). Podowski teaches that the ordered programs are stored on the aircraft for subsequent in-flight replay. (Podowski, col. 3, lines 1-2). However, Podowski does not teach displaying the programs in response to any particular data or signal, including the composite signal and/or program request. Furthermore, as previously discussed, the composite signal and/or program request are not order wire data.

Claim 17 is nonobvious over Leuca and Podowski because Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest at least: (1) storing order wire data in a storage unit at a location; (2) order wire data being received by a satellite receiver at the location; (3) video data being received by the satellite receiver and stored in the storage unit in response to the order wire data; (4) electronically receiving the order wire data from a transmitter at the

location with a receiver while the mobile platform is proximate the location; (5) storing the order wire data on-board the mobile platform; and (6) displaying video images on-board the mobile platform in accordance with video data stored on-board the mobile platform or with video signals being received by a mobile platform satellite receiver in response to the order wire data. Claims 18-19, 22, and 25-30 depend from independent claim 17 and are nonobvious for at least the same reasons as claim 17. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4. Therefore, the rejection of claims 17-19, 22, 25-30, and all other claims depending from claim 17, over Leuca in view of Podowski is improper.

4. Claims 4-5 and 20 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Leuca in view of Podowski because Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Claim 4 recites the system of claim 1 "wherein the wireless docking transceiver is a short range transceiver." Claim 5 recites the system of claim 1 "wherein the wireless platform transceiver is a radio frequency short range transceiver." Claim 20 recites the method of claim 17 "wherein the electronically receiving step utilizes a short range wireless receiver." Regarding the rejection of each of claims 4, 5 and 20, the Examiner cited Leuca at col. 3, lines 18-30:

> The external pipes can be various wireless pipes, or air links, to a ground-based station or gateway, or to a satellite system. According to the invention, the different external pipes that can be used with the present invention can be an existing terrestrial link system, such as the North American Terrestrial System (NATS) or the European Terrestrial Flight Telephone System (TFTS), a direct air link to a terrestrial gateway, a link to a Low Earth Orbit (LEO) and/or a Medium Earth Orbit (MEO) satellite system, and/or a link to one of the emerging broadband Satellite-based systems, such as the Digital Broadcast Satellite (DBS) or Teledesic systems.

The cited passage of Leuca appears to disclose possible embodiments for an external data pipe from an airborne system to a ground-based station, such as gateway 22 and antenna 21 described in Leuca. Leuca does not disclose, teach or suggest a **short-range** transceiver at this passage or anywhere else in its disclosure.

Podowski does not cure Leuca's deficiencies. Podowski discloses that a LAN connection from an airline terminal to an aircraft may be a transceiver. However, Podowski does not disclose or specify that the transceiver is a **short-range** transceiver. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 4, 5 and 20 is improper.

5. Claims 7-8 and 23-24 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Leuca in view of Podowski because Leuca and Podowski, alone or in proper combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Claims 7 and 23 recite the system of claim 1 and the method of claim 17, respectively, "wherein the mobile platform is a boat, ship or train." Claims 8 and 24 recite the system of claim 1 and the method of claim 17, respectively, "wherein the mobile platform is a road travelling vehicle."

Regarding the rejection of claims 7 and 23, the Examiner cited Leuca at col. 2, lines 48-66. Leuca discloses a "high bandwidth delivery and internet access for **airborne** passengers." (Leuca, title). Leuca discloses that "[t]he present invention provides a method and a system providing two way data communications between an **airborne data terminal station**, such as a personal computer (PC) or a laptop computer, and a ground-based network, such as the Internet." (Leuca, col. 2, lines 48-52). Leuca further discloses that "[a]ccording to the invention, system 10 is located on an **airborne platform, such as an airplane, a helicopter or a space vehicle**." (Leuca, col. 2, lines 62-64). Nowhere in the disclosure of Leuca is there a teaching, suggestion or hint that the system taught by Leuca may be used in a non-airborne vehicle such as a boat, ship or train.

Podowski does not cure Leuca's deficiencies. Podowski discloses "[a] communication system [that] includes a distribution center which collects and processes signals from one or more program sources, and distributes these signals in compressed format to one or more **airline terminals**, each terminal in communication with one or more parked **aircraft**." (Podowski, abstract). Podowski also does not teach or suggest in any way that the communication system

may be used in a non-airborne vehicle such as a boat, ship or train. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 7 and 23 is improper.

With regard to the rejection of claims 8 and 24, the Examiner stated, "[o]fficial notice is taken of the fact that it is well known in the art to incorporate passenger entertainment systems in road vehicles (e.g., buses), for the purpose of providing passengers with video entertainment and other interactive services." As explained above, Leuca and Podowski refer solely to airborne vehicles and make no reference whatsoever to road traveling vehicles. Appellant respectfully traverses the Examiner's conclusory reliance on common knowledge and respectfully requests evidentiary support for the Examiner's conclusions. See MPEP 2144.03 ("an assessment of basic knowledge and common sense that is not based on any evidence in the record lacks substantial evidence support…. [i]t is never appropriate to rely solely on common knowledge in the art without evidentiary support in the record as the principle evidence upon which a rejection was based"). Accordingly, the rejection of claims 8 and 24 is also improper.

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Previously Presented) A communication system for a mobile platform, the mobile platform being stationary at a docking area, the communication system comprising:

a server located in the docking area and comprising a wireless docking area transceiver, a first satellite receiver, and a first storage unit, the server being configured to store order wire data received by the first satellite receiver, and to store video data received by the first satellite receiver in the storage unit in response to the order wire data;

a second satellite receiver located on the mobile platform;

a wireless platform transceiver on the mobile platform receiving the order wire data and the video data from the wireless docking area transceiver while the mobile platform is at the docking area; and

a second storage unit, the second storage unit being located on the mobile platform, wherein the second storage unit stores the video data for playback in the mobile platform and the second storage unit storing the order wire data, the order wire data controls a source of video for playback of a program being either video data in the second storage unit or the second satellite receiver, or both the second storage unit and the second satellite receiver.

2. (Original) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the video data includes Internet data, safety message data, advertisement data or entertainment data.

3. (Original) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the mobile platform is a bus, truck, boat, ship, airplane, helicopter, car, train, gondola, van, or monorail vehicle.

4. (Original) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the wireless docking transceiver is a short range transceiver.

5. (Previously Presented) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the wireless platform transceiver is a radio frequency short range transceiver.

6. (Original) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the mobile platform is an airplane.

7. (Original) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the mobile platform is a boat, ship or train.

8. (Original) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the mobile platform is a road traveling vehicle.

9. (Original) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the video data includes Internet data.

10. (Original) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the video data includes safety message data.

11. (Original) The communication system of claim 1, wherein the video data includes entertainment data and advertisement data.

12. (Previously Presented) A video system for a mobile platform, the mobile platform capable of traveling to a docking area, the docking area having a first transceiver for providing data representative of video, the video system comprising:

a wireless transceiver configured to receive the data representative of video and order data from the first transceiver;

a first storage unit coupled to the wireless transceiver, the first storage unit storing the data representative of video and the order data;

a first satellite receiver configured to receive video data from a satellite; and

a processor coupled to the first storage unit and the first satellite receiver, the processor determining whether to use the data representative of video from the first storage unit or the video data from the first satellite receiver in response to the order data, the processor generating a program in response to the data representative of video stored in the first storage unit or the video data received by the first satellite receiver;

wherein the first transceiver is included as part of a server located in the docking area, the server comprising the first transceiver, a second satellite receiver, and a second storage unit, the server being configured to store the order data, wherein the order data is received by the second satellite receiver, and to store the data representative of video, wherein the data representative of video is received by the second satellite receiver and stored in the second storage unit in response to the order data.

13. (Previously Presented) A communication system for a mobile platform, comprising:

a server located in the docking area and comprising a first satellite receiver, and a first storage unit, the server being configured to store order wire data received from the first satellite receiver, and to store video data received from the first satellite receiver in the storage unit in response to the order wire data, the server further comprising a first means for transmitting first data, at least a portion of the first data including the video data and the order wire data;

second means for receiving the first data from the wireless docking area transceiver, the second means being located at the mobile platform;

third means for receiving satellite video data from a satellite, the third means being located at the mobile platform;

fourth means for storing the first data received by the second means, the fourth means being located in the mobile platform; and

fifth means for controlling video data for a program from either of the fourth means or the third means to be displayed on board the mobile platform in response to the order wire data.

14. (Original) The communication system of claim 13, wherein the mobile platform is an aircraft.

15. (Original) The communication system of claim 13, wherein the mobile platform video data is safety information.

16. (Original) The communication system of claim 13, wherein the second means transmits mobile platform operational data to the first means.

17. (Previously Presented) A method of showing video images related to the video data on a mobile platform, the mobile platform capable of traveling to a location, the location having a server comprising a transmitter, a satellite receiver, and a storage unit, the method comprising:

storing order wire data in the storage unit, wherein the order wire data is received by the satellite receiver;

storing video data in the storage unit, wherein the video data is received by the satellite receiver and stored in the storage unit in response to the order wire data;

electronically receiving the video data and the order wire data from the transmitter with a receiver while the mobile platform is proximate the location;

storing the video data and the order wire data on-board the mobile platform;

receiving video signals from a satellite transmitter by a mobile platform satellite receiver; and

displaying the video images on-board the mobile platform in accordance with the video data stored on-board the mobile platform or with the video signals being received by the mobile platform satellite receiver in response to the order wire data for a program.

18. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the video data includes Internet data, safety message data, advertising data, or entertainment data.

19. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the mobile platform is a bus, truck, boat, ship, airplane, helicopter, car, train, gondola, van or monorail vehicle.

20. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the electronically receiving step utilizes a short range wireless receiver.

21. (Original) The method of claim 17, further comprising transmitting control information to the transmitter.

22. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the mobile platform is an airplane.

23. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the mobile platform is a boat, ship or train.

24. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the mobile platform is a road traveling vehicle.

25. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the video data includes Internet data.

26. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the video data includes safety message data.

27. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the video data includes advertisement data.

28. (Original) The method of claim 21, wherein the control information includes identity information.

29. (Original) The method of claim 28, wherein the control information includes destination information.

30. (Original) The method of claim 21, wherein the control information includes operational status information.

31-38. (Canceled).

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 9, 2009

By / Karl F. Reichenberger /

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26383
Telephone: (414) 319-7347
Facsimile: (313) 297-4900

Karl F. Reichenberger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,276